

The China Mail.

Established February, 1845.

VOL. XL. No. 0474.

號廿四四年四百八十八一千英

HONGKONG, THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1884.

日九月三申甲

PRICE, \$2 PER MONTH.

AGENTS FOR THE CHINA MAIL.

LONDON.—F. ARKELL, 11 & 12, Clement's Lane, Lombard Street, E. C. GEORGE STREET & Co., 30, Cornhill. GORDON & GOTCH, Ludgate Hill, E.C. BATES HENDY & Co., 31, Walbrook, E.C. SAMUEL DEACON & Co., 150 & 154, Leadenhall Street.

PARIS AND EUROPE.—GALLIEN & FILS, 30, Rue Lafayette, Paris.

NEW YORK.—ANDREW WIND, 21, Park Row.

AUSTRALIA, TASMANIA, AND NEW ZEALAND.—GORDON & GOTCH, Melbourne and Sydney.

SAN FRANCISCO AND AMERICA. Ports generally.—BAIN & BLACK, San Francisco.

SINGAPORE, STRAITS, &c.—SATIE & Co., Square, Singapore. G. HEINRICH & Co., Manila.

CHINA.—Macao, Messrs. A. A. DE MELLO & Co. Suttor, QUILLER & Co.

AMoy, WILSON, NICHOLLS & Co.

Foochow, HEDD & Co., Shanghai,

LANE, CRAWFORD & Co., and KELLY & WALSH, Yokohama, LANE, CRAWFORD & Co.

Bank.

HONGKONG & SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION.

PAID-UP CAPITAL, \$5,000,000.
INSTALMENT RECEIVED ON NEW SHARES, 2,074,744.75

RESERVE FUND, \$2,500,000.
INSTALMENT OF PREMIUM RECEIVED ON NEW SHARES, 1,663,361.66

\$4,063,361.66

COURT OF DIRECTORS.
Chairman—A. P. McIVER, Esq.
Deputy Chairman—F. D. SASSOON, Esq.
C. D. BOTTOMLEY, M. GROTE, Esq.
A. GÜNTZOW, Esq.
H. L. DALYMPLE, Hon. W. KESWICK,
Esq.
W. H. FORBES, Esq.
M. E. SASSOON, Esq.

CHIEF MANAGER,
Hongkong, THOMAS JACKSON, Esq.
MANAGER,
Shanghai, EWEN CAMERON, Esq.
LONDON BANKERS—London and County Bank.

HONGKONG.
INTEREST ALLOWED.

ON Current Deposit Account at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum on the daily balance.

For Fixed Deposits.—
For 3 months, 3 per cent. per annum.
" 6 " 4 per cent. "
" 12 " 5 per cent. "

LOCAL BILLS DISCOUNTED.
Credits granted on approved Securities, and every description of Banking and Exchange business transacted.

Drafts granted on London, and the chief Commercial places in Europe, India, Australia, America, China and Japan.

T. JACKSON,
Chief Manager.

Offices of the Corporation,
No. 1, Queen's Road East,
Hongkong, April 2, 1884.

583

Notices of Firms.

NOTICE.

THE PARTNERSHIP between Messrs. STEPHENS & HOLMES having expired on the 31st March, 1884, I have this day REMOVED my OFFICE to No. 18, BAKE BUILDINGS, Queen's Road Central, opposite Pedder's Street.

MATTHEW J. D. STEPHENS.
Hongkong, April 1, 1884.

NOTICE.

THE PARTNERSHIP between Messrs. STEPHENS & HOLMES, Solicitors, TERMINATED on the 31st March, 1884, and the Undersigned will continue to practice in his own Name at No. 24, QUEEN'S ROAD, adjoining the Hongkong Dispensary.

HENRY J. HOLMES.
Hongkong, April 2, 1884.

NOTICE.

THE COMPANY now grants passages THROUGH TO LONDON & Marseilles, including the Continental Railway fare, at the same rate as for the route by sea to London, viz., \$380.

The fare to Marseilles is now similar to that charged to Brindisi or Venice, viz., \$365.

A. MOYER,
Superintendent.

Hongkong, March 13, 1884.

NOTICE TO PASSENGERS.

THIS COMPANY now grants passages THROUGH TO LONDON & Marseilles, including the Continental Railway fare, at the same rate as for the route by sea to London, viz., \$380.

The Company will take its own risks of Insurance, for which purpose one-fifth of the paid up Capital will be set aside to meet any loss which may arise.

Considering the handsome result obtained during the past year and the good prospects for future trade in Philippine Islands, combined with the possibility of obtaining Government subvention in the new mail contracts to be offered next year, it is reasonably expected that a still better result will follow.

The responsibility of Shareholders is limited to the nominal amount of their shares.

Application for Shares should be made to the accompanying form, and addressed to the General Managers.

PHILIPPINE TEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

MESSRS. BIRCHAL, ROBINSON & Co., MANILA.

HOLME, RINGER & Co., NAGASAKI.

HOLME, RINGER & Co.,

ENGINERS, BOILER MAKERS,

COPPER SMITHS, BRASS & IRON

FOUNDERS, &c.

WEST POINT IRON WORKS.

HAVING this Day commenced Busi-

ness, are ready to undertake Work of the above Descriptions under the Super- vision of an EXPERIENCED EUROPEAN.

Orders executed with the utmost despatch and at moderate terms.

24th September, 1883.

611

Intimations.

THE CHINESE INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.

NOTICE.

M. R. SAMUEL J. GOWER has This Day been appointed SECRETARY to the above Company.

By Order of the Board of Directors,
E. R. BELLIOS,
Chairman.

Hongkong, April 1, 1884.

568

HOTEL DE L'UNIVERS,
WYNDHAM STREET, HONGKONG.

THE Undersigned begs to notify the Public of Hongkong and the Coast Ports that he will RE-OPEN

THE HOTEL DE L'UNIVERS
on the 1st March.

The whole of the ROOMS have been NEWLY FURNISHED throughout, and there are ROOMS suitable for either MARRIED COUPLES or Single Persons.

THE TABLE will be supplied with the BEST the market can provide.

The WINES and LIQUORS supplied,

both at the Bar and Table, will be of the VERY BEST BRANDS.

GENTLEMEN desirous of taking Meals, such as TIFFINS and DINNERS, can have ALL REQUISITE information by applying to

GEORGE STAINFIELD,
Proprietor.

Hongkong, February 28, 1884.

368

NOTICE.

C. L. THEVENIN'S WINE and SPIRIT STORES, from this date, been temporarily REMOVED to No. 4, PEDDAR'S HILL.

Hongkong, March 20, 1884.

542

COMPANIA NAVIERA DE FILIPINAS.

CAPITAL, \$500,000, Divided into 5,000 Shares of \$100 each.

On Allotment \$10 per Share, and the Balance on 30th April, 1884.

PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE.

Chairman: GONZALO TUASON, Esq., (Messrs. J. M. TUASON & Co.)

Vice-Chairman: JULIO HEYMANN, Esq., (Messrs. BARR, SENTON & Co.)

PEDRO P. ROXAS, Esq., SAN MIGUEL

ALBINO GOYENECHEA, Esq., ANTOLOGUE.

BENITO LEGARDA, Esq., SAN SEBASTIAN.

ANGEL ORTIZ, Esq., SAN GABRIEL.

JASPER M. WOOD, Esq., (Messrs. SMITH, BELL & Co.)

R. CALDER SMITH, Esq., (Messrs. PEEL, HURRELL & Co.)

JOHN OGDEN, Esq., (Messrs. BIRCHAL, ROBINSON & Co.)

GEO. ARMSTRONG, Esq., (Messrs. ARMSTRONG & SLOAN.)

Secretary: JOSE JUAN DE YACZA, Esq.

Banker: THE HONGKONG AND SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION.

General Managers: MESSRS. BIRCHAL, ROBINSON & Co.

H E A D O F F I C E , MANILA.

ADMITTED PROSPECTUS.

THE above Company has been established at Manila, for the purpose of taking over the Spanish Steamer *UZON*, *VISAYAS*, *ESTRELLA*, *SORSOGON*, *CAMIGUIN* and *BOLINAO*, all of which, with the exception of the *BOLINAO*, are now employed in the coasting trade of the Philippine Islands.

The Steamers now running are all in perfect order, having recently been thoroughly overhauled.

After writing off 10 per cent. of the profits for depreciation, and paying 12 per cent. for Insurance, a Dividend of 18 per cent. will be paid to the Shareholders in the above mentioned Steamers during the past year, and it is expected that a still more profitable business will result under the influence of larger Capital and consequent additions to the Fleet.

The New Steamer *BOLINAO*, built by the AMERICAN SHIP BUILDING COMPANY of Paisley, and now on her way out, has been specially constructed to enter the shallow rivers of Davao and Capiz, with a carrying capacity of 250 Tons dead-weight, being the only Steamer in the Philippine trade of her capacity and dimensions.

The Company will take its own risks of Insurance, for which purpose one-fifth of the paid up Capital will be set aside to meet any loss which may arise.

Considering the handsome result obtained during the past year and the good prospects for future trade in Philippine Islands, combined with the possibility of obtaining Government subvention in the new mail contracts to be offered next year, it is reasonably expected that a still better result will follow.

The responsibility of Shareholders is limited to the nominal amount of their shares.

Application for Shares should be made to the accompanying form, and addressed to the General Managers.

PHILIPPINE TEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

MESSRS. BIRCHAL, ROBINSON & Co., MANILA.

HOLME, RINGER & Co., NAGASAKI.

HOLME, RINGER & Co.,

ENGINERS, BOILER MAKERS,

COPPER SMITHS, BRASS & IRON

FOUNDERS, &c.

WEST POINT IRON WORKS.

In conformity with the Prospects of the above Company, I beg to request you to note my application for.....Shares, or any less number, of \$100 each; the first call of \$10 per Share on those allotted to me, will be paid on presentation of this scrip; and the remainder on 30th April 1884.

Name and address } in full

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

THE CHINA MAIL.

No. 6474.—April 24, 1884.

For Sale.

MACLEWEN, FRICKEL & CO.
No. 53, Queen's Road East,
(OPPOSITE THE COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE),
ARE NOW LANDING
FROM AMERICA.

CRAKER COMPANY'S BISCUITS in 5 lb
time, and loose.
SOFT BISCUITS.
Assorted BISCUITS.

Small HOMINY.

Cracked WHEAT.

OATMEAL.

CORNMEAL.

TOPOCAN BUTTER.

Apple BUTTER.

Eastern and CALIFORNIA CHEESE.

CODFISH Biscuits.

Fried HAM and BACON.

Eggs Boiled Condensed MILK.

French BEEF in 2 lb cans.

Boiled MEAL SALMON in 5 lb cans.

Cutting's Dessert FRUITS in 2 lb cans.

Assorted Game VEGETABLES.

Potted SAUSAGE and Sausage MEAT.

Stuffed PEPPERS.

Assorted SOUPS.

Richardson's & Robbin's Celebrated Potted MEATS.

Lunch HAM.

Lamb's TONGUES.

Cream CHOWDER.

Fresh OREGON SALMON.

Dried APPLES.

TOmatoes.

SUCOTASH.

Maple SYRUP.

Golden SYRUP.

LOBSTERS.

OYSTERS.

HONEY.

Assorted JELLIES.

Grated CORN.

FAIRBANKS' SCALES.

400 lb. Capacity.

600 lb.

900 lb.

1,200 lb.

CORN BROOMS
OFFICE HIGH CHAIRS.
AXES and HATCHETS.

AGATE IRON WARE.
WAFFLE IRONS.
SMOOTHING IRONS.

PAINTS and OILS.
TALLOW and TAR.
VARNISHES.

DEVOE'S NONPARIEL
BRILLIANT
KEROSENE OIL,
150° test.

A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF
S T O R E S,
including:

CHRISTMAS CAKES.
PLUM PUDDINGS.
MINCEMEAT.
ALMONDS and RAISINS.

Crystallized FRUITS.
TYSONEAU'S DESSEST FRUITS.
Pudding RAISINS.
Lauie CURRANTS.

Fine YORK HAMS.
PIONIO TONGUES.
PATE DE FOIE GRAS.
SAVORY PATES.

FRENCH PLUMS.
BROWN.
INFANT'S FOOD.
CORN FLOUR.

SPARTAN
COOKING STOVES.

HITCHCOCK HOUSE LAMP.
PERFECTION STUDENT LAMP.

CLARET—
CHATEAU MARGAUX.
CHATEAU LA TOUR, pints & quarts.

RES. GRAVES.

BREAKFAST CLARET, "

SHERRIES & PORT—
SACCOME'S MANZANILLA & AMON-

TILLADO.

SACCOME'S OLD INVALID PORT

(1848).

HUNT'S PORT.

BRANDY, WHISKY, LIQUEURS, &c.—
1 and 3-star HENNESSY'S BRANDY.

BISQUIT DUROCHER & CO.'S BRANDY.

FINEST OLD BOURBON WHISKY.

KINAHAN'S LI WHISKY.

ROYAL GLENDEAN WHISKY.

BOARD'S OLD TOM.

E. & J. BURKE'S IRISH WHISKY.

ROSS'S LIME JUICE CORDIAL.

NOLLY PRAT & CO.'S VERMOUTH.

CHABBE'S GINGER BRANDY.

EASTEEN CIDER.

CHARTREUSE.

MARASCHINO.

CURACAO.

ANGOSTURA, BAKER'S and ORANGE BITTERS.

&c., &c., &c.

BASS'S ALE, bottled by CAMERON and

SAUNDERS, pints and quarts.

GUINNESS'S STOUT, bottled by E. &

J. BURKE, pints and quarts.

DRAUGHT ALE and PORTER, by the

Gallon.

ALE and PORTER, in hogheads.

SPECIALLY SELECTED

C I G A R S.

Fine New Season's CUMSHAW TEA, in

5 catty Boxes.

BREAKFAST CONGOU @ 25 cents p. lb.

MINER'S PATENT FIRE-PROOF

SAFES, CASH and PAPER

BOXES, at Manufacturer's Prices

Hongkong, December 1, 1883.

1043

Mails.



BRITISH MAIL STEAMSHIP
COMPANY.

STEAM TO NAGASAKI AND KOBE,
VIA INLAND SEA.

(Taking Cargo and Passengers for YOKO-

HAMA, VLADIVOSTOK and

COREA.)

SAIGON, SINGAPORE, BATAVIA,

COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ, ISMAILIA,

PORT SAID, SYRIAN PORTS,

NAPLES, MARSEILLES, AND PORTS

OF BRAZIL, AND LA PLATA;

ALSO

BOMBAY.

ON THURSDAY, the 1st May, 1884,

at Noon, the Company's S. S.

YANGTSE, Commandant LORIMER,

with MAILs, PASSENGERs, SPECIEs,

AND CARGO, will leave this Port for the

above places.

Cargo will be forwarded for

London as well as for Marseilles, and ac-

cepted in transit through Marseilles for the

principal places in Europe.

Claims must be settled on board

before delivery is taken, otherwise they

will not be recognized.

CARGO and PASSENGERs for Yokohama

will be transhipped to the Shanghai Mail

Steamer at Kobe, and for Vladivostok and

COREA at Nagasaki and/or Kobe.

For further Particulars, apply at the

Company's Offices, Praya Central, Ground

Floor of Messrs RUSSELL & CO.

H. J. H. TRIPP,

Agent.

Hongkong, April 16, 1884.

658

Mails.

NOTICE.

COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES
MARITIMES.

PAQUEBOIS POSTE FRANCAIS.

STEAM FOR

SAIGON, SINGAPORE, BATAVIA,

COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ, ISMAILIA,

PORT SAID, SYRIAN PORTS,

NAPLES, MARSEILLES, AND PORTS

OF BRAZIL, AND LA PLATA;

ALSO

BOMBAY.

ON THURSDAY, the 1st May, 1884,

at Noon, the Company's S. S.

YANGTSE, Commandant LORIMER,

with MAILs, PASSENGERs, SPECIEs,

AND CARGO, will leave this Port for the

above places.

Cargo will be registered for

London as well as for Marseilles, and ac-

cepted in transit through Marseilles for the

principal places in Europe.

Claims must be settled on board

before delivery is taken, otherwise they

will not be recognized.

CARGO and PASSENGERs for Yokohama

will be transhipped to the Shanghai Mail

Steamer at Kobe, and for Vladivostok and

COREA at Nagasaki and/or Kobe.

For further Particulars, apply at the

Company's Offices, Praya Central, Ground

Floor of Messrs RUSSELL & CO.

H. J. H. TRIPP,

Agent.

Hongkong, April 16, 1884.

704

Notices to Consignees.

FROM LONDON, PENANG AND
SINGAPORE.

THE Steamship *Gloucester* having arrived

from the above Ports, Consignees of

Cargo—with the exception of Opium—are

being landed at their risk into the Godowns

of the Undersigned, whence and/or from

the Wharves or Boats delivery may be ob-

tained.

Optional Cargo will be forwarded un-

less notice to the Consignee be given before

3 p.m. To-morrow, the 21st instant.

A PROCESSION of sandwichmen says, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, each carrying in his arms the similitude of a baby clothed in a glaring scarlet cloak, and with a white hood and collar, could hardly fail to attract attention in the Strand during the busy hours of Saturday afternoon. Some of the passers-by fancied that the directors of a foundling hospital had taken advantage of the sunshine to air their charges and incite the charitably inclined; but it was only the inspiration of a theatrical manager, the plot of whose play turned upon a mysterious baby. The cabmen grimed and the gamins flashed their wit as the unscrupulous sandwichmen slowly passed along, but the aim of the advertising genius was attained.

While the workmen at Messrs. Gill & Son's shipbuilding yard, Rochester, were engaged in sawing a portion of an old ship's mizzenmast, formerly belonging to a man-of-war, at Chatham, a 32-pounder iron shot was discovered embedded in the mast, the aperture having been plugged up. The mast in question had been lying for a considerable time at Chatham Dockyard, and is believed to have belonged to Nelson's *Victory*. It is worthy of note that 32-pounder shot was the largest in use for naval warfare during Nelson's time. It is not long since the *Victory*'s mizzenmast was discovered astern stowed away at Chatham Dockyard, where it had been lying for a number of years unnoticed. The sail was riddled with shot fired during the battle of Trafalgar.

GENERAL Gordon has not, as yet, says *Truth*, proved a success at Khartoum. He may, but, if so, it will surprise me. Judging from the extracts from his works which the *Pall Mall Gazette* has published, his mind upon many points is such that Dr. Forbes Winslow would have no compunction in signing a certificate to confine him in a Lunatic Asylum, for the cracks and oddities of Mr. Wadell were nothing in comparison with those of the General. He is brave, honest, and, in many ways, admirable. But I suspect that he entirely over-estimated his influence with the Soudanese. His suggestion to make Zebher, the chief of the slave-dealers, Governor of the Soudan, coupled with his proclamation legalizing slavery, commands itself to few, and his appointment of the Mahdi as Sultan of Korofan is hardly in accordance with his approval of our attacking the Mahdi's lieutenant, Osman Digna.

"W." writes to the *St. James's Gazette* in favour of serving out revolvers to our troops when engaged in such operations as the present in the Soudan. These weapons are light, and could easily be carried in the belt; and many a man would have a chance of saving the life of a hard-pressed companion-in-arms who now sees his slaughtered under his eyes. Officers who have been in these rushes appreciate the value of the deadly efficiency of the revolver." In his "Good Word for the *Brave*," writes a correspondent, "Mr. Archibald Forbes insisted on the superiority of that weapon to the sword alone, but did not touch the question of its being matched against the spear or sword plus the shield, as with the Zulus. As far back as 1853 a trial of the weapon under these conditions was held, six privates of the Guards being armed with the bayonet against six armed with sword and shield. In every case the sword and shield won easily, and in two cases the bayonet failed to score a single point. It was the more remarkable as, though all the men were proficient with the bayonet and sword, none had ever tried to manage the target before."

On Tuesday, (March 18th) the fourth England-bound team of Australian cricketers sailed from Melbourne by the steamship *Saturn*. Five of the thirteen players now on their way to England are visiting us for the fourth time. Chief of these is W. L. Murdoch (the captain), who perhaps one of the best known living, and most popular of 183, not cut, against England, and 286, not cut, against Australia, made in 1880 and 1881 respectively, have been recently supplemented by his grand innings of 321, made while playing for New South Wales against Victoria. The other four are A. C. Bonner, J. M. Blackham, H. F. Boyle, and F. R. Spofforth; the "famous bowler" having been permitted to join the team at the eleventh hour. Three others of the team—namely, Palmer, McDonnell, and Bonnor—are on their third visit, and three more are on their second. It is noticeable that every member of the eleven is a really good batsman, while eight of them are also very effective bowlers. Spofforth is a great gain to the team, and English cricketers will be pleased to learn that he has not persisted in his refusal to join the eleven. As bowler, batsman, and wicket-keeper respectively, Spofforth, Murdoch, and Blackham are all unrivaled; and it is evident that the Australian team of 1881 will be an unusually strong one. The first match will be played against Lord Sheffield's eleven at Sheffield Park on the 12th of May.

This bill that was introduced last year by Mr. Barrah, M. P., for the registration of firms is this year fathered by Mr. Norwood, M. P. According to this proposal a firm would have to be registered whenever its name did not consist of the full or usual name of the firm, or of all the acting partners without addition. And every person would have to register who carries on business under a firm name consisting of or containing a name or addition other than his own full or usual name. Whenever a firm or person is registered in this way the name is to be used in all matters connected with the business carried on. The particulars required to be registered are—(1) the firm-name; (2) the nature of the business; (3) the place of business; (4) the full name, usual residence, and other occupation (if any), of the persons who carry on; and (5) where a business is commenced in the future, or a new place of business established, the date of both these events is to be registered. These particulars are to be written out by the person registering in the presence of a justice of the peace or a solicitor, &c., by whom his signature is to be attested. And where over there is a change in the constitution of a firm or in its name there is to be a re-registration. For default in registration the penalty is to be a fine not exceeding £1, for every day during which the default continues. The maximum sum is to be a sum sufficient for which the punishment may be imprisonment with hard labour for two years. The person with whom a registration is to be effected is the registrar of joint stock companies, and he is directed to transmit abstracts of registrations to the County Court registrars. The statements thus registered are to be open to anyone's inspection on the payment of a small fee.

SUPREME COURT.

Before the Hon. James Russell, Justice of the Peace.

Thursday, April 24.

SZ PUN AND SZ ARUN v. LUM TUN.

Mr. E. Mackean, instructed by Messrs. Sharp, Toller, and Johnson, appeared for the plaintiffs; and Mr. A. G. Wise, instructed by Messrs. Brearley, Nott, and Deacon, represented the defendant.

In this case the plaintiffs are said to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was the first wife of the deceased, but this is denied by the defendant, Lum Tun, who says Chi Mak See was only a concubine, and claims to be the first wife herself. The defendant further contends that the plaintiffs, being the children of the concubine, are not the legitimate sons of Tzai Kai Fong under English law.

The plaintiff's case is that the defendants, the plaintiff's parents, were stated to be the sons of Tzai Kai Tun, deceased, by his first wife, Chi Mak See. Tzai Kai Tun, who was a native of the province of Fukien, was formerly a merchant carrying on business in Hongkong. He died intestate on the 3rd September, 1882, leaving three wives. Plaintiffs affirm that Chi Mak See was

THE CHINA REVIEW.

PUBLISHED BI-MONTLY, TENTH YEAR.

THIS Review, which was intended to meet the wants of many students of Chinese and caused by the discontinuance of "Notes and Queries on China and Japan," has reached its Twelfth Volume. The Review discusses those topics which are uppermost in the minds of students of the "Far East" and about which every intelligent person connected with China or Japan is desirous of acquiring trustworthy information. It includes many interesting Notes and original Papers on the Arts, Sciences, Ethnology, Folklore, Geography, History, Literature, Mythology, Natural History, Antiquities, and Social Manners and Customs, etc., etc., of China, Japan, Mongolia, Tibet, etc., and of the Far East generally. Recently a new edition has been taken of the Review, now giving special attention to Trade, Commerce, and Economic topics of Travel by well-known writers. It was thought that by extending the scope of the Review in this direction, the Magazine would be made more generally useful.

The Review department receives special attention, and enclosures are made to present a careful and concise record of Literature on China, etc., and to give critiques embodying sketches of the most recent works on such topics. Authors and Publishers are requested to forward works to "Editor, China Review," care of China Mail Office.

The Notes and Queries are still continued and form an important means of obtaining from and diffusing among students knowledge on obscure points.

The Correspondents column also affords further and greater facilities for the interchange of views and discussion of various topics.

Original contributions in Chinese, Latin, and any of the Modern Languages are received. The papers are contributed by the members of the various Consular, the Imperial Customs, and Hongkong Services, and also by the Missionary bodies amongst whom a high degree of Chinese scholarship is assiduously cultivated. Amongst the regular contributors are Drs. Chalmers, Titel, Breytenbriher, Hirth, and Hanco, Professor Legge, and Messrs. Balfour, Watterson, Stent, Phillips, MacIntyre, Groot, Janisch, Faber, Kopack, Parker, Playfair, Giles, and Piton, all well-known names, indicative of sound scholarship and thorough mastery of their subject.

The Subscription is fixed at \$6.50 per annum, postage included—payable in advance. Orders for binding volumes will be promptly attended to. Address, "Manager, China Mail Office."

OPINION OF THE PRESS.

"All our learned societies should subscribe to this scholarly and enterprising Review."—Northern Christian Advocate (U.S.).

"The China Review" is an excellent table of contents.

"The publication contains subjects of interest to students in the Far East and the present will hold favourable if not advantageous comparison, with preceding numbers."—Colonial Empire.

"This number contains several articles of interest and value."—North China Herald.

"The China Review" for September—October fully maintains the high standard of excellence which characterizes that publication, and altogether forms a very interesting and readable number. Meteorologists will find an interesting and valuable contribution by Dr. Fritsch, on "the Amount of Precipitation (Rain and Snow) of Peking," showing the results of observations made at the Imperial Russian Observatory at Peking, from 1841 to 1880. "Notes on the Dutch Occupation of Formosa," by Mr. Goo Phillips, contains some interesting information, although much of it is second-hand. The Notices of New Books include a most general and appreciative review of "The Divine Classic of Nan-Hue," and the Notes and Queries are as usual very interesting."—North China Daily News.

A general and reliable Review which all students of China and the Chinese world do well to patronize."—Chrysanthemum.

The November—December number of the China Review contains less variety than usual, but the few articles are very interesting. The opening paper by Mr. Horbert A. Giles on "The New Testament in Chinese" treats of a question that must necessarily be of great importance in the eyes of all missionaries. Mr. E. H. Parker's "Short Journeys in Szechuan" are continued, and a goodly instalment of these travels in the interior of China is given. Mr. F. H. Balfour contributes a paper of some length entitled "The Emperor Cheng, founder of the Chinese Empire," which will be read with genuine interest by students of Chinese history. A few short notices of New Books and a number of Notes and Queries, one of which "On Chinese Gaths in Western Borneo and Java" might appropriately have been placed under a separate heading, complete the number."—H. K. Daily Press.

Truman's Oriental Record, containing the following notes of the China Review—The Review is now published, judging by the number few weeks before us, it is intended to occupy a position, as regards China and the neighbouring countries, some what similar to that which has been filled in India by the Calcutta Review. The great degree of attention that has been bestowed of late years upon the investigation of Chinese literature, antiquities, and social developments, to say nothing of linguistic studies, has led to the accumulation of important stores of information rendering some such channel of publicity as is now provided extremely desirable; and contributions of much interest may fairly be looked for from the members of the foreign consular services, the Chinese Customs' corps, and the missionary body, among whom a high degree of Chinese scholarship is now assiduously cultivated, and who are severally represented in the first number of the Review by papers highly creditable to their respective authors. Some translations from Chinese novels and plays are also to be seen, and an account of the career of one of the Chinese statesmen of the eleventh century, Sun Fung-p'o, by Mr. E. C. Bowers. This number is not historically valuable, but is also distinguished by its literary grace. Beside notices of new books relating to China and the East, which will be a useful feature of the Review, if carried out with punctuality and detail, we are glad to notice that "Notes" and "Queries" are destined to find a place in its pages also. It is to be hoped that this opening for contributions on Chinese subjects may evoke a similar degree of literary zeal to that which was displayed during the lifetime of its predecessor in the field, and that the China Review may receive the support necessary to insure its continuance.

N G W. R E A D Y.

THE COMMERCIAL LAW AFFECTING CHINESE; with special reference to PARTNERSHIP REGISTRATION AND BANKRUPTCY LAWS IN HONGKONG.

Copies may be had at the China Mail Office, and at Messrs. Lane, Crawford & Co.,—Price, 75 cents.

Hongkong Rates of Postage.

In the following Statements and Tables the Rates are given in *cents*, and are, for Letters per *half ounce*, for Books and Parcels, per *two ounces*.

Newspapers over four ounces in weight are charged as double, triple, &c., as the case may be, but such papers or packets of paper may be sent at Book Rate. Two Newspapers must not be folded together as one, nor must anything whatever be inserted except bona fide Supplements. Printed matter may, however, be enclosed, if the whole be paid at Book Rate. Prices Current may be paid either as Newspapers or Books.

Commercial Papers signify such papers as, though written by hand, do not bear the character of an actual or personal correspondence, such as invoices, drafts, copied documents, &c. The charge on them is the same as for books, but, whatever the weight of a packet containing any partially written paper, that, as a general rule, is liable to Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.

1. No *Letter*—or *Packet*, whether to be registered or unregistered, can be received Postage if it contains gold or silver money, jewels, precious articles, or anything that, as a general rule, is liable to

Customs duties.

2. This Regulation prohibits the sending of Patterns of dutiable articles, unless the quantity sent be so small as to make the sample of value.

3. The limits of weight allowed are as follows:

Books and Papers—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs.; *to the Continent, &c.*, 4 lbs. Patterns—*to British Offices*, 5 lbs. if with out intrinsic value; *to the Continent, &c.*, 8 oz.

4. The public are cautioned not to confound these facilities with a *Parcel Post* to Europe, &c., which does not exist.

It is necessary that the following rules be strictly observed.